



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AUTHORSHIP OF *REVENGE FOR HONOUR*

I

The title-page of the first edition of this tragedy contains these words: "Revenge for Honour. A Tragedie, by George Chapman. London, printed for Richard Marriot, in S. Dunstan's Church-yard, Fleetstreet. 1654." *The Parricide, or Revenge for Honor* was entered in the Stationers' Register, November 29, 1653, for the same publisher, with the name of Glapthorne as the author. Another probable early mention of this play is found in Sir Henry Herbert's license-book for May 27, 1624: "For the Prince's Company. A play called *The Parricide*."¹

That the same publisher within the period of one year ascribed *Revenge for Honour* to two different playwrights invalidates the credibility of the title-page. Even if this were not the case, absolute trust could not be given to the unsupported testimony of this title-page, printed twenty years after Chapman's death, and forty years after the time at which he is thought to have ceased writing for the stage. Perhaps Marriot was ignorant or uncertain of the authorship. If this was the case, there was an advantage in attributing the play to Chapman, who was long since dead, rather than to Glapthorne, who we know was in 1643 still publishing poems, and who in 1654 either was still alive or had only more or less recently died.² That Chapman's name was still well known to the reading public and therefore desirable for title-page use is shown by the reprinting of *Caesar and Pompey* in 1653, and of *Bussy D'Ambois* in 1641, 1646, and 1657, by the continuous popularity of the Homer translations, by the appearance of *The Ball* and *Philip Chabot* in 1639 with Chapman's name in both cases preceding Shirley's on the title-page, and by the publication under Chapman's name in the same year with *Revenge for Honour* of the probably spurious tragedy *Alphonsus, Emperor of*

¹ Taken from Mr. F. G. Fleay's transcription of the License-book in his *Chronicle of the London Stage*.

² We do not know the date of his death. His slight biography has not been traced later than 1643. See A. H. B.'s article on Glapthorne in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

Germany. The improbability of his having written the last-named play increases, I may suggest, the improbability of his having written *Revenge for Honour*.

An examination of the play itself reveals the presence of different subjects, methods of workmanship, and qualities of style from those found in Chapman's known works.

Of the six tragedies certainly written in whole or in part by him—the two Bussy plays, the two Biron plays, *Chabot*, and *Caesar and Pompey*—five are placed in France and deal with characters and events of French history, and the remaining one has a subject taken from Roman history. All of his tragedies profit thus from the dignity that may be found in historical subjects and the popular interest legitimately attaching to them. They are not, however, chronicle-plays, but tragedies. Chapman's treatment of his sources is somewhat like that of Shakspeare; for example, in the case of the Biron plays and *Caesar and Pompey*, as Professor Koeppe¹ and Professor Boas² have shown, he follows his sources with a mixture of freedom and fidelity, being willing, when it suited his purpose, to be a mere poetic translator or rearranger of his sources. *Revenge for Honour* has a subject of a very different nature from that of any of Chapman's known works. Its origin is neither classical nor French; the scene is laid in a part of the world in which Chapman has in his known dramas shown no interest; and the historical element common to all of his known tragedies is here absent. A source has been suggested by Professor Schick in the story of the Turkish prince, Mustapha, which is contained in Knolles' *History of the Turks* (1603). Diligent search by Professor Koeppe¹ and others has failed to reveal any other source. If the Mustapha story supplied the substance borrowed by the author of *Revenge for Honour*, it will be agreed that he made only the freest and slightest use of it. Probably a complete source does not exist. Professor Koeppe¹ believes that the dramatist developed the plan himself with a free use of elements found on the stage and in the literature of the time, which he put together into a new complete whole.

¹ *Quellen und Forschungen*, 1897.

² *Introd. to Chapman's tragedies in "Belles-Lettres Series."*

This after all amounts to saying that the author in collecting his material and constructing the play proceeded according to the methods of the Fletcherian or eclectic school, rather than to those of the earlier dramatists among whom Chapman's development took place.

Revenge for Honour does not accord with the theory and practice of tragedy-writing illustrated in all of Chapman's undoubted tragedies and in part enunciated in the Dedication prefixed to the *Revenge of Bussy*. "Material instruction" and "elegant and sententious excitation to virtue and deflection from her contrary" are so fully present in Chapman's tragedies as to form perhaps their most striking characteristic. In *Revenge for Honour* moralizing and didactic speeches are not to be found; and neither the rant and bombast of Chapman nor his lofty flights of poetry are to be matched there.

Of the two rather completely differentiated species of the Tragedy of Blood seen on the Elizabethan stage, all of Chapman's undoubted tragedies point to the structural method of the one, *Revenge for Honour* to that of the other. These two general species¹ are respectively the Kyd type (e. g., *Spanish Tragedy*, *Hamlet*, Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*, Tourneur's tragedies, and Webster's *White Devil* and *Duchess of Malfi*) and the Marlowe type (e. g., *Jew of Malta*, *Lust's Dominion*, *Massacre of Paris*). The Senecan influence in Chapman is stronger than is usual in the dramatists of the so-called Kyd school; much of it is of Seneca rather than of Kyd, whether derived directly or through the medium of English theatrical conventions. Examples of Senecan influence are the Nuntius in *Bussy* (II, i) and *Caesar and Pompey* (II, i), long narrative passages in *Revenge of Bussy* (IV, i) and *Biron's Conspiracy* (IV, i, the whole scene), the Umbra in *Bussy* and *Revenge of Bussy*, the Stoic suicide of Clermont D'Ambois and Cato, and the large amount of Senecan philosophizing and moralizing in all the tragedies. These qualities are wanting in *Revenge for Honour*, as they are in the Marlowe type generally.

¹ For this classification I am partly indebted to Dr. E. E. Stoll's *John Webster*, pp. 94 ff., and to Professor F. G. Hubbard's "Repetition and Parallelism in Elizabethan Drama," in *Mod. Lang. Ass'n. Pub.*, Vol. XX, p. 375.

Omens (e. g., *C. and P.*, III, pp. 366, 367;¹ *Bir. Trag.*, IV, p. 256; *Rev. of Bus.*, V, pp. 205*b*, 209*a*), presentiments, and foreshadowings of tragedy (*Bussy*, I, p. 143*b*, and III, p. 154*a*; *Rev. of Bus.*, V, p. 205*b*; *Bir. Trag.*, IV, p. 256; *C. and P.*, III, p. 366*a*) and direct supernatural prophecies (of spirits in *Bussy*, IV, pp. 166–68, and *Rev. of Bus.*, V, p. 209*a*, of an astrologer in *Bir. Conspir.*, III, p. 232*b*, of a soothsayer in *C. and P.*, III, p. 366*b*, and in a dream in *Rev. of Bus.*, V, p. 208*b*) are also absent from *Revenge for Honour*, as is the element of fatalism that we feel in the presence of supernatural forces, and that is sometimes put into expression by the characters themselves (e. g., Tamyra's speech, *Bussy*, III, p. 154*b*). The motives which lead up to the bloody conclusions of *Bussy* and *Revenge of Bussy* and in general of plays of this type are those of duty imposed from without on the avenger, of revenge felt to be righteous. On the contrary, in the Marlowe type of the Tragedy of Blood, the motive is not sacred nor is it obligatory on the protagonist; it is a matter of lust, ambition, or personal resentment. So it is in *Revenge for Honour*. In short, this tragedy is neither conceived nor executed in the same spirit as those of Chapman: it shows a different bent of mind and results of training in a different dramatic school.

Want of symmetry in dramatic structure, subordination of action and movement to declamation, and excellence in details, and especially in rhetorical, poetic, and often epical passages, rather than in the dramatic whole, are qualities that in varying degrees belong to all of Chapman's tragedies. Of *Revenge for Honour* the dramatic structure is sufficiently regular and careful. It moves consistently forward, though slowly until near the end; the love story and the story of political intrigue are so closely intertwined as to become practically identical; the few short comic scenes do not lose sight of the real plot and do not long hold the attention from it. There is no trace of the ethical declamations of Clermont and Cato, the passion, boastfulness, and rant of Bussy and Biron, the episodic structure of *Revenge of Bussy*, the Biron plays, and *Caesar and Pompey*, and the strong narrative element

¹ References by act and page to *Revenge for Honour* and Chapman's plays are made to R. H. Shepherd's ed. of Chapman's works (1874). In the few instances where scene and line are given for *Bus.* and *Rev. of Bus.*, the "Belles Lettres" volume of Chapman is meant.

already mentioned. Chapman's idiosyncrasies of weakness and strength are alike absent. Moreover, the general management and machinery of the plot are different. To the audience it is always clear what Chapman's characters plan to do: when an action takes place, we are prepared for it, and there is never need of looking back in the light of after-events to understand what has happened previously. This is in general the procedure of the earlier dramatists including Shakspeare. With *Revenge for Honour* it is quite different. The unexpected happens again and again: the audience is not in the confidence of the author, but is often kept as much in the dark as are the characters of the tragedy themselves. The purpose of Abilqualit's whispered consultations with Mesithes (II, p. 427*b*) and with the Mutes (III, p. 435*a*) come to light only later on in the action. The giving way of Caropia to Abilqualit's wooing (II, p. 428*b*), her murder of her husband (IV, p. 441*a*), the stabbing of Caropia by Abrahen (V, p. 447*a*), the latter's suicide (V, p. 447*a*), and Abilqualit's death at the hands of Caropia (V, p. 447*b*), are all surprises. The motive is revealed in each case *after* the act. The concealment of the plan until its consummation is obviously deliberate on the part of the author. This is one of the tricks of the later or Fletcherian school.¹

The style shows no trace whatever of the involved syntax, of the want of distinct articulation, of the heavy obscurity that so often attend Chapman's style. The swelling speech, the grandiloquence and hyperbole of the D'Ambois and Biron plays² are also wanting in *Revenge for Honour*. There is, indeed, exaggeration and inflation in a few of the speeches of Mura and Abrahen,³ but it is of a different kind: it is tamer and more conventional, and it wants Chapman's energy, boldness, and vigor. Clarity and ease of expression and gracefulness of imagery are prevailing characteristics of the style of *Revenge for Honour*. Mr. Swinburne has spoken of the "close and intense observation of nature . . . at all times distinctive of this poet" (Chapman), and of his "quaint

¹ This Fletcherian characteristic is dwelt on by Dr. E. E. Stoll in his *John Webster*, pp. 171 ff. On p. 10 I have cited examples of its use by Fletcher.

² E. g., *Bussy*, pp. 147*a*, *b*, 163*b*, 164*a*; *Biron Consp.*, pp. 230*a*, 238*b*, 239*a*.

³ E. g., *Rev. Hon.*, pp. 431*b*, 444*b*.

fondness for remote and eccentric illustration."¹ In *Revenge for Honour* there are also many figures of speech taken from nature. It is here, perhaps, that the play comes nearest to Chapman. Even in this respect, however, the resemblance is not close or significant. Though a few of the images in the disputed play are original and striking,² the greater number are conventional.³ They possess grace, clearness, and fitness, qualities for which Chapman is not remarkable. There is also wanting the setting within which Chapman's figures are most multiplied, that of "elegant and sententious" moralizing and of active narration and description. Nowhere, moreover, is there a striking parallelism⁴ or a close resemblance to Chapman.

Chapman's diction contains many words used in their direct etymological rather than derived sense and a few directly formed by him from classical sources and used instead of the slightly different current form.⁵ There is nothing of this kind in *Revenge for Honour*.

The versification is of the looser kind. Feminine endings abound; the lines, like those of Fletcher, sometimes defy scansion—they must be "felt rather than scanned;" and lines of more than

¹ Professor F. I. Carpenter has given many examples of these traits in his *Metaphor and Simile in the Minor Elizabethan Drama*, pp. 106 ff.

² Pp. 429b, 432a, 443b.

³ "Transparent as clear air or crystal" (p. 422b); "like a thick cloud 'tween me and greatness" (p. 422b); "like melancholy turtles" (p. 423b); "dangers like swift lightning" (p. 427a); "vice like a small cloud" spreads (p. 434a); chastity, "the brightest star in the heaven of virtues" (p. 436b); "like the young phoenix" (p. 444a); eyes compared to diamonds (p. 444a); etc.

⁴ *Rev. Hon.*, p. 447a, has the words, "to procure her passage | To the eternal dwellings." Cf. *Bus. D'Am.*, p. 175b (in "Belles-Lettres Series," V, iv, ll. 107, 108), "and tell them all that D'Ambois now is hasting | To the eternal dwellers." This slight dictional parallel may easily be accidental, or it may be due to a common borrowing from a classical source. Professor Boas has shown that the passage in *Bus. D'Am.* closely follows Seneca, *Her. Oct.*, pp. 1525, 1526 (see note on the passage in "Belles-Lettres Series").

⁵ "Adust" (*Bir. Consp.*, p. 224a) = scorched, parched; from L. *adurere* = to burn.

"Expuate" (*Bir. Consp.*, p. 222b) = spit out, ejected; *N. E. D.* cites only this passage.

"Euicts" (*C. and P.*, p. 373b) = extorts; "euiction" (*Bir. Tr.*, p. 288b) = conviction.

"Innative" (*Rev. of Bus.*, II, i, 159.) = innate, native (rare and obs., *N. E. D.*).

"Exquire" (*Bussy*, IV, iii, 29) = find out by searching.

"Maritorious" (*Rev. of Bus.*, II, ii, 34) = fond of one's husband.

"Abhorreth" (*Bussy*, V, iv, 28) = shrinks from with dread.

"Gurmundist" (*Bussy*, I, i, 59) = epicure. *N. E. D.* finds this word only in Chapman.

Many more examples could be cited. Several of these are taken from the glossary cards of Professor T. M. Parrott's forthcoming edition of Chapman's dramatic works, which is to be published by Routledge & Co.

the customary length are, in comparison with those of Chapman's undoubted plays, so numerous and so hard to classify that in E. Elste's treatment of Chapman's blank verse¹ a separate list of the longer lines in *Revenge for Honour* was found necessary. The following table taken from Elste's work shows a large gap in the proportion of double endings between Chapman's plays and *Revenge for Honour*, and even a larger gap in the case of the triple endings. The gap between *Alphonsus* and *Revenge for Honour* is also great.

	Verse lines	D. E.	Percentage of D. E.	Trip E.	Percentage of Trip E.	Percentage Rhyme
<i>Bussy</i>	2355	632	26.8	11	.5	6.9
<i>Rev. of Bus.</i>	2374	649	27.3	11	.5	7.9
<i>Bir. Consp.</i>	1936	470	24.3	10	.5	4.
<i>Bir. Tr.</i>	2254	493	21.9	13	.6	5.
<i>Caes. and Pompey.</i>	1860	580	31.2	21	1.1	4.
<i>Alphonsus</i>	2338	305	13.	12	.5	1.2
<i>Rev. Hon.</i>	2169	954	44.	96	4.4	1.

The only hypothesis that can explain Chapman's authorship of a tragedy so different from the rest of his work, is that late in life, apparently after a long cessation from dramatic composition, he resumed play-writing and decided to write a tragedy resembling those being constructed by some of the successful dramatists of the younger school. This means that he chose a subject of a kind not found elsewhere in his works—of oriental court life—treated his sources in a new way, built up the structure much on the plan of one of Fletcher's plays,² wrote contrary to his avowed theory of tragedy, excluded omens, presentiments, and supernatural agencies, foreswore his allegiance to the Kyd-Seneca tragedy in order to ally himself with that of the Marlowe tradition, rejected ethicism, declamation, narration, and description, reversed his whole *looking-forward* method of preparing the way carefully for all that was to come to the *looking-backward* method of surprise, constructed smoothly and regularly, expressed himself with ease and grace, employed the Fletcherian versification, and in general cast off like a garment all that had been most distinctive of him, whether of

¹ Emil Elste, *Der Blankvers in den Dramen George Chapmans* (1892), pp. 46-48.

² *Cupid's Revenge*. See p. 12 *infra*.

strength or of weakness. Many of these differences are not superficial but fundamental, and seem to represent differences in genius and taste, in inclination and training. That even a poet of much less pronounced and individual manner than Chapman and of less advanced age could so completely have changed is improbable almost to the degree of impossibility and absurdity. For those who ascribe *Alphonsus* to Chapman, the difficulty is even greater, as *Revenge for Honour* shows no more resemblance to its companion late play than it does to Chapman's known work.

II

Who the author of *Revenge for Honour* actually was is not easy to determine with certainty. Even the date of composition is not sure, though it seems probable, as I have said before, that *The Parricide* (entered in the Herbert MS May 27, 1624, for the Prince's Company) is the same as *The Parricide, or Revenge for Honor* (entered in S. R., 1653). In August, 1623, the Prince's Men left the Curtain Theater for the Red Bull.¹ Mr. Fleay sees in the last two lines of the prologue of *Revenge for Honour*—

You've graced me sometimes in another sphere,
And I do hope you'll not dislike me here—

an allusion to this change of theaters. If this supposition of Mr. Fleay is correct, additional probability is given to this identification.

Neither the Herbert MS entries nor other contemporary documents have record of a dramatist writing for the Prince's Company at that time to whom we could reasonably attribute *Revenge for Honour*. Dekker and Day's *Bellman of Paris*,² Ford, Dekker, and Rowley's *Witch of Edmonton*, "young" Johnson and Broome's *Fault in Friendship*, Ford and Dekker's *Fairy Knight*, Sampson's *Widow's Prize*, five or six old anonymous plays,³ and *The Parricide* are the only plays that we know that this company acted in

¹ Fleay, *Chron. Hist. of London Stage*, p. 299.

² Apparently written originally for the Revels Company. See Fleay's transcript of the Herbert MS in his *Chron. Hist. of London Stage*, p. 301.

³ Fleay mentions also Barnaby Barnes' *Madcap*. Barnes died in 1609 (see A. H. B.'s article on Barnes in *D. N. B.*); hence this play is too old to be considered.

1623-24; and these with two or three by Middleton and Rowley are the only ones that documentary evidence connects with this company between 1616 and 1632. Little or no resemblance is evident in *Revenge for Honour* to the known productions of any of these dramatists. Dekker and Day are both of an older school than the author of *Revenge for Honour*. Sampson's two extant plays are slipshod in dramatic structure, and wanting in movement and in grasp of the characters. The versification is also unlike that of *Revenge for Honour*. It is bare, fairly regular, and prosaic; it lacks the facility and smoothness and the abundance of feminine endings of the latter. Ford and Broome are in different ways equally unakin to our author. Middleton's versification with its large number of feminine endings is more like that of *Revenge for Honour* than is that of the other dramatists just mentioned. Yet there is not a trace in *Revenge for Honour* of the unmistakable cadence of Middleton's longer serious passages. Middleton's slightness of *enjambement*, almost complete absence of light and weak endings, and great frequency of feminine endings before the caesura are mechanical points that differentiate his verse from that of *Revenge for Honour*. The choice of images and the general aesthetic quality are also quite different.

In order, then, to find dramatic kinship to *Revenge for Honour*, one must look elsewhere than in the work of the few men positively known to have been writing for the Prince's Company at that time. Earlier in this paper I pointed out reminders of Fletcher. The versification shows many double endings and not a few triple endings, and much of the peculiar Fletcherian fall and rhythm. On the other hand, the unstopped lines are numerous; often the verse-construction seems to take the speech, rather than the line, as unit. There is no play of Fletcher in which the *enjambement* is so frequent and so free. Some of this, however, there is in Fletcher, varying from play to play.¹ The accented and often monosyllabic eleventh syllable of the blank

¹ The uncertainty as to whether some of the plays in the Fletcherian cycle are partly by another dramatist makes citation difficult. Some critics tend to regard as un-Fletcherian any passage in a play supposedly by Fletcher which does not contain the extreme type of Fletcher's verse; they do not suppose this facile and expeditious writer able or willing to vary his style even slightly.

verse line, a feature very characteristic of Fletcher, is found fairly often in *Revenge for Honour*.¹

I have given above (p. 5) illustrations of the use by the author of *Revenge for Honour* of the "method of surprise," an effective means by which Fletcher stimulated and sustained interest.² Indeed, numerous common devices and parallels in situation are found in *Revenge for Honour* and plays of Fletcher. Abilqualit's disclosing to Tarifa in asides (*Rev. Hon.*, IV, p. 437b) what he openly denies immediately afterward is clearly copied from the Melantius-Calianax conversation in *Maid's Tragedy* (IV, ii);³ the humorous yet not unfeeling comments in the presence of tragedy at the end by the comic character Selinthus (*Rev. Hon.*, V, p. 447) are like those of Calianax (*M. T.*, V, iv); and the partly comic escape of offenders at the beginning of a new reign is also paralleled in *Maid's Tragedy* (*Rev. Hon.*, IV, p. 442a; *M. T.*, V, iv). The attitude of Tarifa toward royalty—openly critical of wrongs and uncringing yet intensely loyal to whoever sat on the imperial throne or was heir apparent—is close to that of Aecius in *Valentinian*, Aubrey in *Bloody Brother*, and (less fully) Amintor in *Maid's Tragedy*. The arousal of Almanzor's suspicions of his son Abilqualit by the story of the people's love for

¹ "When the Emperor's countenance . . .
Does not cry chink in pocket, no repute is
With mercer, nor with tailor; nay, sometimes, too,
The humour's pregnant in him, when repulse
Is given him by a beauty; I can speak this" (p. 419a).

"Apted to the magnificence of his off-spring" (p. 419a).

"'Tis fit the prince march. I've observed in him, too" (p. 425a).

"I'll not conjecture; only I should grieve, sir" (p. 425a).

"As we will have him shortly, 't shall go hard else" (p. 432b).

"And on this vicious prince, like a fierce sea-breach" (p. 432a).

² Examples of this: in *Valentinian*, unexpected murder of Maximus by Eudoxia, suicide of Pontius, killing of Valentinian by Phidias and Aretus, and suicide of these two; in *Women Pleased*, discovery that Claudio is Isabella's brother in disguise and that he is not in love with her, but has been putting her chastity to the test; in *Wife for Month*, *Monsieur Thomas*, and other Fletcherian plays there are startling surprises and changes of face of the characters; in *Sp. Curate*, turning out of Bartolus's breakfast to be a hoax, sudden revelation late in the play of Violante's monstrous character, discovery that Jamie's plot to murder his brother is only pretense; in *Women Pleased* (III, ii, p. 188b), *Cupid's Rev.* (I, iv), and other Fletcherian plays, whispering of something important, as in *Rev. Hon.* (IV, p. 435a), of which the audience learns later.

³ References to Fletcher's or B. and F.'s plays follow Darley's ed.

him and of their desire to make him king (*Rev. Hon.*, II, p. 424) is precisely the trick used to prejudice the Emperor against Aecius in *Valentinian* (IV, i), and Leontius against his son Leucippus in *Cupid's Revenge* (III, iii). Caropia tells Abilqualit (*Rev. Hon.*, II, p. 429) frankly that it is ambition and a sense of his royal position, as well as her affection, that cause her to give herself up to him; later she submits herself to Abrahen, when he becomes Emperor, though she had refused him her affection so long as he was merely a younger brother of the royal house. Compare with this two speeches of Evadne, the first to Amintor, the second to the King (*M. T.*, II, i, and III, i):

. . . . it was the folly of thy youth
To think this beauty
. . . . shall stoop to any second.
I do enjoy the best, and in that height
Have sworn to stand or die. You guess the man.

and

I swore, indeed, that I would never love
A man of lower place; but, if your fortune
Should throw you from this height, I bade you trust
I would forsake you, and would bend to him
That won your throne: I love with my ambition
Not my eyes.

The presence of stock types in the *dramatis personae* is also characteristic of Fletcher: Selinthus, "an honest merry court lord," Mura, "a rough soldier," Osman, "a captain," Gaselles, "another captain." Compare Soto, "a merry servant" (*Wom. Pl.*), Leontius, "a brave old merry soldier" (*Hum. Lieut.*), Amintor, "a noble gentleman" (*M. T.*), Galatea, "a wise modest lady" (*Philaster*). Of the five types found by Professor Thorndike in each of the B. and F. romances¹—(a) the lovelorn maiden; (b) the depraved, shameless woman of the Evadne-Bacha type; (c) the loving, noble, generous hero; (d) the faithful friend who is also a blunt counselor and brave soldier; and (e) the poltroon of the type of Pharamond, Bessus, Timantus—the last four are present in *Revenge for Honour* in the persons of Caropia, Abilqualit, Tarifa, and Mesithes. Only "the lovelorn

¹ *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare*, pp. 123, 124.

maiden" is absent, and Thorndike seems to think this type in the romances mainly the work of Beaumont.¹

Changes from immoral to moral position like that of Abilqualit, or *vice versa*, are also common in Fletcher. Abilqualit has sinned and never repented, yet he is made to appear virtuous and to merit our sympathy. Isabella in *Women Pleased* and Maximus in *Valentinian* are examples of this in plays solely by Fletcher.

In an attempt to prove that Chapman was greatly influenced by the later dramatists, Dr. Stoll² has, I think, very clearly shown that *Revenge for Honour* borrowed much from *Cupid's Revenge* (first printed in 1615). His points I have included in quotation marks:

1. "A young prince (Leucippus—Abilqualit) lyingly denies before his father, the King, what would stain the name of the sensual woman he loves (Bacha—Caropia), though prompted to acknowledge the truth by his rough soldier-friend (Ismenus—Tarifa). *Cup. Rev.*, p. 387; *Rev. Hon.*, p. 437 (situation derived originally from the *Arcadia*)."

2. "The pretense urged by the prince's enemy (Timantus—Abrahen) that the prince has plotted against the King's life (*Cup. Rev.*, p. 398; *Rev. Hon.*, p. 438)."

3. "The popular uprising which frees the prince (*Cup. Rev.*, p. 400;³ *Rev. Hon.*, pp. 438, 446)." A corresponding uprising in a closely corresponding situation takes place in *Val.*, pp. 462, 463. There is also a popular uprising to free Philaster, who like Abilqualit is beloved by the people, natural heir to the throne, and about to be unjustly debarred (*Phil.*, V, iii, pp. 46, 47).

4. "The king his father dies suddenly; in *Rev. Hon.* by poison, as is probably the case in *Cup. Rev.* (it is not clear)."

5. "The prince stabbed by craft, in either case at the very close of the play, by the sensual woman whose honor he had defended." Similarly to Abilqualit, Maximus (in *Val.*, V, viii, p. 465), who

¹ *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakespeare*, p. 129.

² E. E. Stoll, *John Webster*, Appendix II, p. 213. Dr. Stoll does not question Chapman's authorship of *Rev. Hon.*

³ G. C. Macaulay in *Francis Beaumont, A Character Study*, p. 85, finds this uprising wholly in Fletcher's style.

has been placed on the throne by popular uprising, meets his death immediately at the hands of the woman whom he has just taken from the deposed emperor.

6. "In his last words the prince, Hamlet-like, names his rough soldier-friend (Tarifa—Ismenus) heir and successor." The end of *Bloody Brother*¹ is also very much like that of *Revenge for Honour*: the concluding speeches have to do with the punishment of the wrongdoers, the reward of the just, and the succession to the vacant throne of the honest, straightforward, and, amid the kaleidoscopic changes, solely constant figure (Tarifa—Aubrey; see p. 10). The last lines of the two plays are much the same in substance:

Selintus. Long live Tarifa, Caliph of Arabia!

Tarifa. We have no time now for your acclamations;

These are black sorrow's festival. Bear off

In state that royal body; for the other,

Since 'twas his will, let them have burial,

But in obscurity. Be this as it may,

As by an evident rule be understood,

They're only truly great who are truly good.

—*Revenge for Honour*, V, p. 448.

¹ *Lord*. We are ready all to put the honour on you, sir.

Aubrey. These sad rites must be done first. Take up the bodies.

This as he was a prince, so princely funeral

Shall wait on him; on this honest captain,

The decency of arms; a tear for him too.

So, sadly on, and, as we view his blood,

May his example in our rule raise good.

—*Bloody Brother*, V, ii, p. 539.

7. "At the close there is similar Machiavellian cursing on the part of the villain (Bacha—Abrahen) when in the throes of death."

8. "The rough soldier-friend, Tarifa, is a striking imitation of Ismenus, especially in his attitude toward the conflicting interests of the woman (cf. Dion's ruthlessness toward Arethusa for Philaster's sake, III, i, p. 36, and Melantius's toward his sister Evadne for Amintor's; cf. also Leontius in *Hum. Lieut.*, IV, iv, p. 254b).

¹ Written, according to Fleay, after 1623. Like some other plays here quoted it is only partly by Fletcher.

Osman also, another captain and friend, is like Ismenus in this respect, uses similar language of ladies in general and this one in particular (*Rev. Hon.*, p. 441b; *Cup. Rev.*, p. 402b, etc.)."

9. "The contrast and antagonism presented between the points of view of court lords and warriors: Timantus and Ismenus (*Cup. Rev.*, pp. 384, 391, 396; Selinthus and the two captains—Osman and Gaselles, *Rev. Hon.*, pp. 416, 417)."

10. "Fletcherian two-word feminine endings in some number, interesting and lively conduct of plot, a Beaumont and Fletcher levity even at tragic moments (Selinthus, *Rev. Hon.*, p. 447; *Cup. Rev.*, II, v, etc.)."

The proportion of feminine endings in F.'s plays has been treated in greater or less detail by G. C. Macaulay (*Francis Beaumont, A Character Study*), E. F. Oliphant (*Eng. Stud.*, Vol. XIV, p. 57), F. G. Fleay (*T. N. S. S.*, 1874, and *Sh. Manual*), and Robt. Boyle (*Eng. Stud.*, Vol. V). The first two say that two-thirds or more of F.'s lines have this characteristic. Boyle gives for F.'s part of plays written with Beaumont percentages varying from 30.3 per cent. to 47.9 per cent., and for plays written with Massinger, percentages from 52.3 per cent. to 75.9 per cent. Fleay's tables of percentages are not at present accessible to me. Dr. Elste's table¹ gives the percentage of double and triple endings of *Revenge for Honour* as 48.4 per cent. Only in Fletcher or in Massinger at his greatest is so large a percentage to be found among Elizabethan dramatic writers.

The connecting links in incidents and dramatic devices of *Revenge for Honour* to *Cupid's Revenge* are too numerous and close to be explained as accidental. The resemblances to other Fletcherian plays in these respects and in versification are also real and strong. Apparently either the shaping hand of *Revenge for Honour* was that of a gifted and adaptable follower of Fletcher who knew the works of his master well and borrowed the latter's devices and even his substance copiously and imitated his manner successfully, or the shaper of the play was Fletcher himself. The main objections to supposing Fletcher himself to be the author are the infrequency of the Fletcherian verse in its extreme form and the presence of

¹ See p. 7 of this article.

longer and more elaborately developed images than Fletcher customarily used. These objections may be partly explained away in the next section of this paper.

III

As was stated in the beginning, the entry of *Revenge for Honour* in the S. R. ascribed the play to Henry Glapthorne, though the title-page contained the name of George Chapman. Without corroborative evidence of some kind, this entry is of little importance; if, however, other indication may be found that Glapthorne had some connection with the play, the S. R. entry becomes significant. On account of the paucity of contemporary allusion to *Revenge for Honour*, we are forced back on a search for internal evidence.

The date of neither the birth nor the death of Glapthorne is known. His plays were all printed in 1639 and 1640, except *The Lady Mother*, which was for the first time printed in Bullen's *Old English Plays* (1882-86). The composition of Glapthorne's dramatic works is apparently included by the years 1635-40. He is known to have been writing non-dramatic poetry as late as 1643.¹ The following are his plays: (1) *Albertus Wallenstein*, tragedy; (2) *Ladies' Privilege*, comedy with serious plot; (3) *Lady Mother*, comedy with serious plot; (4) *Argalus and Parthenia*, pastoral tragedy; (5) *Hollander*, boisterous comedy of intrigue; (6) *Wit in a Constable*, boisterous comedy of intrigue.

Glapthorne was a better poet than dramatist. His plots are wanting in point and in firmness of structure, and his characterization shows a corresponding want of grasp. Even the best of his plays, *Albertus Wallenstein*, *Ladies' Privilege*, and *Lady Mother*, lack depth, strength, vitality, and genuineness of passion. Judged simply as poetry, however, some of his passages are good: his images are often graceful and felicitous, though likely to be too flowery, or to be overloaded with sentimentality.

In choice and treatment of subject, in dramatic structure and devices, and in character-treatment, no striking resemblance

¹ For all that is known of his life and work, see Mr. A. H. Bullen's article on "Glapthorne" in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*

appears between *Revenge for Honour* and Glapthorne's plays. The disputed play is in general much the superior. The versification is also dissimilar: the main difference is in the much smaller proportion of feminine endings used by Glapthorne. Smoothness, regularity, and a tendency toward monotony distinguish his verse. There is a general similarity between Glapthorne's more serious plays and *Revenge for Honour* in the kind and substance of the images, many of which are taken from nature. The one strong piece of internal evidence, however, in favor of attributing a share in the play to him is the presence in several instances of whole phrases or sentences in *Revenge for Honour* and in one or another of Glapthorne's plays. The following are the most striking parallels that I have noted:

Caropia. The amorous turtles, that at first acquaintance .
 Strive to express in murmuring notes their loves,
 Do when agreed on their affections change
 Their chirps to billing.

Abilqualit. And in feather'd arms
 Encompass mutually their gaudy necks.

—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 428b.

The modest turtles which
 In view of other more lascivious birds
 Exchange their innocent loves in timorous sighs,
 Do when alone most prettily convert
 Their chirps to billing; and with feather'd arms
 Encompass mutually their gaudy necks.

—*Ladies' Privilege*,¹ p. 99.

Do I think
 When I behold the wanton sparrows change
 Their chirps to billing, they are chaste?

—*Lady Mother*, I, p. 124.

. . . a sudden chillness,
 Such as the hand of winter casts on brooks,
 Thrills our aged heart.

—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 439a.

¹Citations from G.'s plays are taken from Pearson's Reprint except for *Lady Mother*, which is in Vol. II of Bullen's *Old English Plays*.

. . . . with what impudence
 Canst thou behold me, and a shivering cold,
 Strong as the hand of winter casts on brooks,
 Not freeze thy spirits up.

—*Hollander*, II, p. 102.¹

. . . . he has polluted
 By this foul fact my fame, my truth, my goodness,
 Strucken through my dignity by his violence:
 Nay, started in their peaceful urns, the ashes
 Of all my glorious ancestors; defiled
 The memory of their still descendent virtues;
 Nay, with a killing frost, nipped the fair blossoms
 That did presage such goodly fruit arising
 From his own hopeful youth.

—*Revenge for Honour*, IV, p. 436b.

. . . . suppose
 I had with patience borne this scandalous name
 Of a degenerate coward, I not only
 Had nip'd the budding valor of my youth,
 As with a killing frost, but left a shame
 Inherent in our family, disgraced
 My noble father's memory, defamed,
 Nay cowarded my ancestors, whose dust
 Would a' broke through the marbles, to avenge
 To me this fatal infamy.

—*Ladies' Privilege*, IV, p. 141.

Can you think, sir,
 that when baths of oil
 Are poured upon the wild irregular flames.
 In populous cities, that they'll then extinguish?

—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 432a.

¹The important point here is that both the image and the diction are parallel. The image itself is fairly common. Compare—

"My soul is shaken with a nipping frost."

—*Alb. Wallenstein*, p. 63.

"I know not what creeps o'er my heart
 And leaves a chill beneath it."

—Chapman and Shirley's *Philip Chabot*, p. 542b.

I may state that Professor Parrott (who has recently edited *All Fools* and *Gent. Usher* in the "Belles-Lettres Series" and is soon to bring out Chapman's plays complete) tells me he feels sure that the passage containing this image was revised by Shirley. Shirley's *The Brothers* contains a passage somewhat suggestive of this one.

" . . . but death
 Hath in few hours made him as stiff as though
 The winds of winter had thrown cold upon him."

—*Dyce's ed.*, IV, v, p. 249.

You will rage more than unlimited fire
In populous cities.

—*Ladies' Privilege*, p. 102.

Our progress should be swift,
As is the passage of unlimited fire
In populous cities.

—*Alb. Wallenstein*, p. 31.

Words writ in water have more lasting essence
Than our [women's] determinations.

—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 445b.

And let their words, oaths, tears, vows pass
As words in water writ.

—*Argalus and Parthenia*, III, p. 43.

I'll take as little notice
Thou art my offspring as the wandering clouds
Do of the showers, which when they've bred to ripeness
They straight disperse through the vast earth forgotten.

—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 435b.

I will quite put off
The name of father, take as little notice
Thou art my offspring, as the surly North
Does of the snow, which when it has engendered
Its wild breath scatters through the earth forgotten.

—*Alb. Wallenstein*, IV, p. 57.

Strongly similar to the figures at the close of these two
speeches are those in the following two:

Sir, your words
Are superficial, as a shadow which
The morning sun produces and black night
Renders forgotten.

—*Hollander*, III, p. 122.

. . . . this Emperor whom we
Will break as showers do bubbles, which themselves
Of nothing had created.

—*Alb. Wallenstein*, II, p. 30.

. . . . be't death,
'T shall be as welcome as sound healthful sleeps
To men oppress'd with sickness.

—*Revenge for Honour*, IV, p. 441b.

. . . . death and I are almost now at unity.

—*Ibid.*, V, 448a.

. . . . death and I have been
 Play-fellows these many years, he'll only bring me
 To rest as pleasing to my sense as sleep
 After a tedious watching.

—*Ladies' Privilege*, III, p. 133.

Spare my son and I shall go
 As willingly to death as to my rest
 After a painful child-birth.

—*Lady Mother*, p. 191.

Call back the constant spring into thy cheeks,
 That droop like lovely violets o'ercharged
 With too much morning's dew; shoot from thy eyes
 A thousand flames of joy.

—*Revenge for Honour*, p. 440b.

So violent rain weeps o'er the purple heads
 Of smiling violets, till its brackish drops
 Insinuate among the tender leaves,
 And with its weight oppress them.

—*Hollander*, II, p. 108.

Oh, you two
 Are clearer, sweeter than the morning dew
 Falling in May on lilies. . . . There doth fly
 Immediate comfort from Aminta's eye.

—*Argalus and Parthenia*, p. 26.

These parallels are so striking that they cannot have been accidental. As Mr. Bullen has said,¹ "Anyone who has had the patience to read the plays of Henry Glapthorne cannot fail to be amused by the bland persistence with which certain passages are reproduced in one play after another." This repetition links his plays more or less closely together and establishes a connection of *Revenge for Honour* with them. The hypothesis might be advanced that Glapthorne simply borrowed these passages from *Revenge for Honour*. Such an hypothesis, however, is, as I have just shown, unnecessary; it is also unlikely on the face of it, as *Revenge for Honour*, though very possibly written many years earlier, was first printed in 1654, long after the writing of all and the printing of all except one of Glapthorne's plays. Or if we suppose that *Revenge for Honour* was written later than Glapthorne's

¹ *Old Eng. Plays*, Vol. II, p. 101.

plays, it is absurd to think that any writer other than Glapthorne would have written a drama containing scattering borrowings of this kind from all of the latter's dramatic works. It may, I think, be taken as proved that Glapthorne had a hand in the final shaping of *Revenge for Honour*.

By way of recapitulation and conclusion, I will state my hypothesis of the composition and publication of the play. In the first place it seems rather probable that *Revenge for Honour* is to be identified with *The Parracide* of 1624. At any rate, it was written in the Fletcherian manner, either by an apt and gifted pupil of Fletcher working strongly under the influence and perhaps with the assistance¹ of the master, or possibly by Fletcher himself. Of the success or failure of the play on the stage nothing is known. Marriot's entry of *Revenge for Honour* with ascription to Glapthorne and publication under the name of Chapman may be variously explained. Glapthorne may have been employed to correct real or supposed profaneness or indecency in the expression—a step not at all uncommon at that time—or to fill in *lacunae* caused by injury or illegibility, or he may have possessed himself independently of the manuscript, worked it over sufficiently to establish some claim to its authorship, and then sold it to Marriot. The latter's decision to use Chapman's name instead of Glapthorne's on the title-page was probably due to the availability of Chapman's name for advertising purposes, perhaps reinforced by the knowledge that Glapthorne after all was only part author or by an erroneous tradition that Chapman really had a hand in the play.

D. L. THOMAS

LAWRENCE, KANSAS
September 16, 1907

¹ This point was suggested to me recently by Mr. Fleay, after he had heard a summary of this paper.